

July 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Resolution in Support of the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to commend to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Montana, in strong support of the war on poverty. This resolution, which encourages each individual member at each VFW post to participate to the fullest possible extent in local and national endeavors to eliminate poverty, is in the fine tradition of civic awareness we have come to expect from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I am especially encouraged that this expression of support of the antipoverty effort comes at a time when the Senate itself is about to renew its commitment to this most worthwhile program. The Office of Economic Opportunity has achieved a remarkable record of progress, and it merits the continued support of us all. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT DEPARTMENT CONVENTION

Whereas, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, through direct action and collective support, have always promoted increased opportunities for all Americans, that every individual, regardless of race, color, creed, or ethnic background, might share in this Nation's abundance, and

Whereas, the Economic Opportunity Act originally passed by Congress in 1964 and since extended and amended in 1965 and 1966, has established programs and mechanisms to enable the poor of our country, in the best American tradition, to break their own cycles of poverty.

Be it resolved, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Montana, assembled in convention at Miles City, Mont., June 7 through June 10, 1967, stand unanimously in favor of continuing and expanding the vital efforts begun, and thus far well advanced, by the Economic Opportunity Act, and that each individual member and post be encouraged to participate to the fullest possible extent in local and national endeavors to eliminate poverty.

And further resolved, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars national magazine, as well as all publications, advise the members of ways and means to help as a community service project those young men and women who have been trained at Government expense to reestablish themselves in the areas where they have been sent for employment, to help those people find housing, learn the area so they can get to and from work, and other things that good Americans do for other good Americans.

And further resolved, that this resolution be forwarded to the national organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for appropriate action at the national convention in New Orleans, La., August 17 through 25, 1967.

Attest:

ROBERT A. DURKEE,
Department Adjutant, Department of
Montana, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mighty Israel: Lesson to World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable international observers is Columnist Richard Pattee, who is featured in the New World, the Chicago archdiocese newspaper. I feel his June 30 commentary on the Middle East war gives an excellent summary and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

MIGHTY ISRAEL: LESSON TO WORLD
(By Richard Pattee)

The post-mortem on the four-day war in the Middle East will doubtlessly go on for a great many years. The spectacular triumph of the Israelis and the total incapacity of the neighboring Arab states to make good their threats provide a lesson for other parts of the world.

A British commentator, Peregrine Worsthorne, has described the situation as the confrontation of the technically developed and the underdeveloped, with the inevitable collapse of the less advanced when faced by the military power of a modern state.

It has been stated over and over again that Israel's principal characteristic is that it is, for all practical purposes, a European-type state in the midst of nations which are only superficially developed. When the show down came, the ability of this highly evolved society was brought to bear on the problem of smashing the infinitely more numerous adversary.

Although the thesis may very well be true, it must also be clear that it applies primarily to developed and undeveloped nations which are geographically juxtaposed. It would not necessarily apply to the U.S. in Vietnam where enormous distance and a very different geography are involved.

In the Israeli-Arab war, the forces were facing one another on their respective frontiers. Moreover the geography of both was identical and there is no huge hostile power, such as China, just to the north of the enemy.

Nevertheless, one of the lessons of the recent Middle Eastern clash must certainly be that none of the African or Middle Eastern countries, even though armed by the Soviet Union or anyone else, is able, as things stand now, to bring down a technically superior enemy, even though his resources and territorial area may be small.

This lesson must certainly be applied to the threats against Rhodesia and South Africa.

There is, indeed, a close analogy between the situations. Rhodesia is a tight little country with a proportionately capable army and excellent leadership. It is unthinkable that any of the neighboring African states on their own could possibly make an invasion stick.

Rhodesia versus Zambia and Tanzania, with the support in theory of other states removed from the immediate theater of hostilities, would be somewhat comparable to Israel in the recent war. The result would probably be the same, the quick thrust and the collapse of the African states.

In the case of South Africa, the situation would be still more similar and on a vast scale. There is something of the same mentality in Israel as in Rhodesia and South Africa: the same conviction of a justified presence; a solid and almost unanimous will to maintain positions and ward off outside interference.

This is accompanied by a far greater in-

dustrial capacity than Israel. In short, the recent war demonstrated that beneath the oceans of verbalism, the inflammatory speeches and the boasts of strength, there was precious little more than bluff and sham.

Unfortunately the deflation of these claims to easy victory on the part of the Arabs, leaves a hundred million people in frustration and humiliation.

The unfortunate thing has been that they were encouraged in political terms to seek for goals which were absolutely unattainable on the field of battle. This state of mind that war will solve the questions still prevails with reference to Rhodesia and South Africa. One wonders if the lesson of defeat will have repercussions as far as the Zambesi.

Peace: A Mandate From Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, following is an article which appeared in the Patriot Ledger, Quincy, Mass., on July 6, 1967, recommending a path to world peace. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues for their consideration:

PEACE: A MANDATE FROM MANKIND

Pride, and the narrow interests of governments and their leaders, have made the establishment of a firm and equitable world peace impossible.

In today's world, governments and their leaders appear to place more importance on saving face and self-interest than on ensuring the survival and well-being of their citizens.

The result is that today's world hangs in a purgatory between war and peace.

Every nation hates war, but no nation, alone or in concert, seems willing to make the first step toward peace.

Because of the national self-interests of its members, the United Nations General Assembly has been unable to do anything constructive toward peace in the Middle East.

The General Assembly's failure is a mirror image of the Security Council's lack of agreement on how to bring about a settlement in an area that has endured three wars in the last two decades.

To its credit, the Security Council has secured a cease-fire between the Arab nations and Israel—a cease-fire, however, is not a peace. The Middle East is only one of the world's trouble spots where a cease-fire is standing duty for a full and honorable peace, as in Korea.

It is now time that nationally self-centered considerations be discarded and the welfare of mankind be taken up. It is now time that the egos of nations and their leaders be forgotten and that peace on this planet becomes the prime consideration.

Only if this is done can the United Nations fulfill its mandate from mankind: "to maintain international peace . . . (and) to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace."

The United Nations is a community responsibility. It places obligations upon all its members, great or small. Its burdens fall most heavily upon the powerful, to whom the whole world should be able to look for guidance.

Thus the U.N., and the people of the world, expect much more than they have been getting in the way of responsible international leadership from President Johnson of

A3416

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 10, 1967

the United States, Premier Kossygin of the Soviet Union, President de Gaulle of France, and Prime Minister Harold Wilson of Great Britain. It is time these men carry out the task of statesmanship and place peace before national prestige.

In its most fundamental sense, the U.N. is an organization of the peoples of the world. Its General Assembly is the only place on earth where each nation, no matter how small, has an equal voice and an equal vote.

With this in mind, there follows a proposal for world peace. It requires that governments place statesmanship before politics, thoughtful consideration before fiery oratory. This proposal must be taken as one complete package, recognizing that many nations must forsake traditional positions in order to find peace for all.

WORLDWIDE

United Nations peace-keeping forces and observer teams shall not be withdrawn from any area without formal U.N. consent, after thorough deliberation.

Any attempt on the part of any nation to use force against United Nations personnel shall be considered aggression against all member states.

Freedom of innocent passage shall be guaranteed for vessels of all nations through all international waterways, including the Gulf of Aqaba, the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal, the Dardanelles Straits and the Bosphorous Straits.

Communist China be offered United Nations membership under a two-China policy. All U.N. members must sign and adhere to the nuclear test ban treaty.

Indian and Pakistan must accept a U.N.-directed settlement in their dispute over Kashmir and agree to respect each other's borders.

Agreements must be reached among U.N. members to halt all arms races.

A treaty prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons must be concluded and signed by all U.N. member nations.

The U.N. shall guarantee and enforce these agreements. All members must agree to fulfill United Nations peacekeeping obligations, including payments of past and future financial assessments, and furnishing of personnel, equipment and services upon request. Nations refusing to meet such obligations shall lose the voting privileges of U.N. membership.

MIDDLE EAST

The Old City of Jerusalem shall be internationalized under U.N. auspices as a world religious shrine, open to people of all faiths and all nationalities.

Arab nations shall recognize Israel's existence as a sovereign state.

Israeli forces shall be completely withdrawn to boundaries existing before the outbreak of last month's war.

Arab military forces shall be prohibited from approaching within 20 miles of Israeli frontiers.

United Nations peace-keeping forces must be stationed—with adequate personnel, equipment and freedom of movement—on both sides of the Israeli-Arab frontiers and at Sharm el Sheikh, the fortress commanding the Strait of Tiran.

Israel and the Arab nations shall agree to respect each other's territorial integrity.

Palestinian Arab refugees shall be permanently resettled and assisted as part of an international economic and technical assistance program for the Middle East, administered by the United Nations and financed by mandatory assessments on all U.N. members. Oil-producing Middle East states shall contribute a percentage of their income from oil to this program.

VIETNAM

The United Nations must accept primary responsibility for ending the war in Vietnam. The Security Council shall be charged with

the responsibility for ensuring a negotiated settlement, with the full cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States.

To implement the negotiations, the United States must cease bombing North Vietnam.

In turn, the United Nations shall ensure that North Vietnam ceases infiltration of men and supplies into South Vietnam.

An immediate cease-fire shall take effect in South Vietnam, to be supervised by United Nations observer teams, as a prelude to a full and honorable peace.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Cuba and all other Western Hemisphere nations must agree to respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Cuba shall rejoin the Organization of American States and participate in the Alliance for Progress with the guarantee that she shall refrain from "exporting revolution".

Cuba shall permit refugees to return to their nation, with full rights of citizenship and return of expropriated property or full and equitable payment for such property.

This proposal is not a complete listing of the answers to the world's problems; however, acted-upon favorably as a complete package it could be the first concrete step to world peace.

For too long, the issues of war and peace have been considered on a limited basis. Only a comprehensive approach, with true humility and conscientious desire, can fulfill mankind's mandate for a life of peace.

Therefore we propose that these suggestions be made the next order of business before the United Nations General Assembly. They should be proposed as a single resolution.

The most urgent problems the world faces today are not wars for national prestige waged on barren deserts or in steaming jungles. The world's greatest problems today are hunger, disease, illiteracy and poverty.

The answers for these four problems can never be found while the world's major powers are concerned with self-interest, while fighting may erupt at any time, anywhere on this globe. For these wars are terribly wasteful of the time, money, knowledge, and human resources needed to conquer today's greatest problems.

The technical capability to conquer hunger and disease exists; the "have-nations" of the world possess the financial resources to apply that technology. Likewise, the developed nations have the ability to eradicate illiteracy.

All that is needed to conquer hunger, disease and illiteracy is a redirection and coordination of resources now being wasted. Once hunger, disease and illiteracy are conquered, poverty will fall by the wayside.

Additional Boys' State Delegates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of June 19, 1967, I entered the names of delegates to Delaware Boys' State in Dover. Because of changes made in the original list of delegates, I insert into the RECORD the names of the following young men who participated in this fine program:

C. Todd Collins, Leonard Campbell, Joseph R. Brem, Jack Hayden, Peyton Lewis, James Kerrigan, Harry G. Temple, Robert Stowe, Jay Reynolds, and Connie Longshore.

Eating High on the U.N. Hog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 10, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of Sunday, July 9, the inimitable columnist, Art Buchwald, does an excellent job of telling the story of that weird organization known as the United Nations.

Buchwald's literary gem needs no further comment. It follows:

EATING HIGH ON THE U.N. HOG

As the United Nations gets larger, its member countries are becoming smaller, and sometimes it's hard to recognize the name of a nation, much less to pronounce it. The other day I was in a restaurant in New York and I got to talking to a man who turned out to be the U.N. Ambassador from Boolah Boolah, a speck of land located somewhere between the Indian Ocean and the Antarctic.

"How many people in your country?" I asked him.

"I think about 2000," he said. "I haven't been home for some time. My brother is the Prime Minister and I'm the Ambassador to the United Nations. We tossed a coin for our jobs, and he lost."

"Then you like being Ambassador to the United Nations?"

"I adore it. The General Assembly is air conditioned, we get diplomatic immunity when it comes to parking and if you get tired of listening to the speeches you can always tune in a transistor radio. Everybody thinks you're listening to the translation of a speaker."

"If you're such a small country, where do you get your funds to entertain?"

"I don't have to do any entertaining. Everyone wants to entertain me. First the Russians take me to lunch, then the Americans take me to dinner, the Arabs have me over for shishkebab and I must say they don't serve a bad breakfast at the Israeli delegation. If you get a good debate like this one, you can eat for months without picking up a check."

"The trick, of course, is never to tell them how you're going to vote. If you align yourself with one side or the other too early, you could starve to death."

"Then it's best to be neutral," I said.

"Absolutely, particularly because the French are always wooing neutral countries, and you know what kind of a feed they can put on."

"You've been entertained by the French?" "Would you believe President de Gaulle sent me a can of foie gras from his own back yard?"

"People really make a fuss over you, then." "Why not? My vote is as important as Great Britain's in the General Assembly, and as long as they don't know which way you're going to go, they have to cater to you."

"How do you finally decide which way you're going to vote?"

"I send a wire back home and ask them what we need. If they cable back that we need a dam, then I inform the Soviet bloc and the United States bloc and I let them bid on it. The highest bidder gets the job and my vote."

"The highest bidder?"

"Yes, whoever offers us the most money is given permission to build our dam."

"That's one way of getting a dam built," I said.

"This doesn't happen every day. We really get most of our aid during an emergency

July 10, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 9257

Canal area, which could escalate again into a major struggle. It is indispensable that the United States maintain a resolute position that the cease-fire must be respected and that Israel will not be allowed to be gravely disadvantaged and jeopardized by the arms supply to the Arab leaders now renewed by the Kremlin on what is apparently a crash basis perhaps for some new offensive purpose. It is for that reason that the posting of U.N. observers to patrol the Suez area is certainly desirable. I note that Israel is likely to accept. I hope the United Arab Republic will, too—if it really is not fomenting the breaches of the cease-fire as propaganda for its internal consumption.

During these months of strain—I say months of strain, in the sense of the coming months—there is also a great opportunity to do something about the Arab refugees—the number variously estimated at 700,000 to 800,000—who are now physically in territory occupied by Israel's forces. The humanitarian aspect of this issue has always been the overriding consideration; therefore, every effort should be made with assistance both public and private physically to settle the Arab refugees in these areas, whatever may be the ultimate political disposition of the area.

Indeed, I am devoting myself at this time to an effort in this regard upon which I shall, in due course, report to the Senate.

While I recognize that there has been considerable discussion about what Israel claims is only the administrative reunification of Jerusalem, there is no question about the fact that respect for the religious shrines of the three great faiths involved will be assured and will be the dominant consideration. Here, too, the critical point is the physical one—that at long last the Holy City is not the subject of intermittent shooting by Arab soldiers on parapets and that communicants of the three great faiths—wherever they may be coming from—may, at last, visit the shrines without hindrance or discrimination, with the peace, order, and propriety which should characterize the environment of these great shrines.

Sixty-three Senators have, in Senate Resolution 143 sponsored by Senator SYMINGTON and myself, shown their support of the policy of our Government in the Middle East. The President has already seen the sentiment of the country supporting this policy, too, as shown by the latest Harris and other polls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Harris poll just referred to.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY: MAJORITY IN UNITED STATES BACKS MOST ISRAELI POSITIONS

(By Louis Harris)

By sweeping majorities—many of them over 80 per cent—the American people support the principal arguments by Israel for a permanent peace in the Middle East. By 3 to 1, the public rejects the original Arab and Russian position in the United Nations that Israel first withdraw its troops from Arab territory before other issues can be settled.

Seven out of ten, however, think that the formerly Jordanian sector of Jerusalem should not be absorbed by Israel but that Jerusalem should be made an international city open to all. And a majority believes that Israel should make concessions to Arabs displaced from their former homeland.

Key Israeli concerns meet with this kind of overwhelming approval in the United States:

82 per cent believe that Israel's existence as a sovereign state should be formally accepted by the Arab nations.

88 per cent think that Israel should be guaranteed the right to send ships through the Gulf of Aqaba, where an Egyptian blockade of Israel's port of Elath helped trigger the recent hostilities.

86 per cent feel that Israel should also have freedom of passage through the Suez Canal.

Two demands made by Russian Premier Kossygin in support of the Arabs are rejected by a decisive majority of Americans:

By 79 per cent to 7 per cent, Americans oppose any U.N. condemnation of Israel as the aggressor in the war and making Israel pay reparations for war damage to the Arab nations.

By 62 per cent to 21 per cent, U.S. public opinion rejects Israeli withdrawal from occupied territory as a precondition to negotiations.

The key to peace in the Middle East, two out of three Americans believe, is to have the world's major powers guarantee all countries in the region against attack by their neighbors. Despite the inability of the United Nations to prevent the most recent war there, 58 per cent believe that the U.N. Security Council is the place where the terms should be worked out. However, there is some disagreement over the best procedure for arriving at a settlement. And 87 per cent also say they favor the Arabs and Israelis working out a settlement without outside interference.

A carefully drawn cross-section of the American people was asked:

"As far as the Middle East situation is concerned, do you tend to agree or disagree that:

Views on Middle East

	Agree percent	Disagree percent	Not sure percent
Israel should be guaranteed the right to send ships through the Gulf of Aqaba.....	88	1	11
Israel should be given the right to use the Suez Canal.....	86	1	13
Israel should be recognized as a state by the Arab nations.....	82	3	15
The Arabs and Israel should work out a peaceful settlement without interference.....	87	13	-----
Jerusalem should become an international city open to all.....	70	10	20
Israel should give full rights to Arabs who live or used to live where Israel is now.....	58	14	28
Israel should withdraw all its forces from Arab territory before other issues can be settled.....	21	62	17

In addition, the cross-section was asked: "The Russians want the U.N. to condemn Israel as the aggressor in the Middle East war and make Israel pay Arab nations for damage done in the war. Do you agree or disagree with such action by the United Nations?"

Russian condemnation of Israel

	Total public (percent)
Agree.....	7
Disagree.....	79
Not sure.....	14

Finally, the public was asked: "Do you think the U.N. Security Council is the proper place where peace terms in the

Middle East can be worked out, or do you think peace should be worked out elsewhere?"

U.N. role in Middle East

	Total public (percent)
Security Council proper place.....	58
Elsewhere.....	28
Not sure.....	14

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our people and our Government will now, notwithstanding dangers and vicissitudes, be called upon to be constant to it. We shall not gain any favor from the Arab leaders if we depart from our policy; on the contrary, the greatest hatred is found in contempt. We simply have to see this one through so that the Arab world may at last have a chance to be redeemed from the parochial fanaticism of its leaders which has kept it immersed in ignorance, disease, misery, and danger for centuries.

Nor need we be blackmailed by threats of cutting off the Middle East's oil. In the first place, it is very doubtful that any such threat can be made to stick in view of the divisions of self-interest in the Arab world. In the second place, the world can, if it must, gear itself to meet the situation, as it did during the Suez crisis in 1956 and 1957.

I have heard discussion this morning about Africa and Vietnam, but here in the Middle East is one place where U.S. foreign policy is right. Let us keep it that way and see that it succeeds and is not diverted or swayed by any efforts on the part of the Soviet Union or the Arab leadership.

CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE SAN FELIPE DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 273, S. 1111.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1111) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "supplies", to strike out "area development,"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "unit" and insert "division"; in line 7, after the word "facilities", to insert "No facilities shall be constructed for electric transmission and distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of an offer of a firm fifty-year contract from a local public or private agency, can through such a contract be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of Government facilities"; after line 13, to strike out:

S9258

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 10, 1967

Sec. 2. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the operation of the San Felipe division, shall be integrated and coordinated from both a financial and an operational standpoint, with the operation of other features of the Central Valley project in such manner as will effectuate the fullest, most beneficial, and most economic utilization of the water resources hereby made available.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized in connection with the San Felipe division to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the division area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of division lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other division purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, and additional development of division lands or facilities, or to dispose of division lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operations of such lands or facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes.

(b) Federal operation and maintenance costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement and Federal costs incurred specifically for land for those purposes and basic recreation facilities shall be non-reimbursable; joint costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement shall in the aggregate be nonreimbursable to the extent they do not exceed the sum of \$7,000,000 plus 10 per centum of the joint costs in excess of \$40,000,000. Provision shall be made for the reimbursement, for the contribution by non-Federal interests, or for the reallocation of costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement in excess of the foregoing limit under one or a combination of the following methods, as may be determined appropriate by the Secretary: (1) provision by non-Federal interests of land or interests therein or facilities required for the division; (2) payment or repayment, with interest at a rate comparable to that for other division functions, pursuant to agreement with one or more non-Federal public bodies; (3) reallocation to other project functions in the same proportion as joint costs are allocated among such functions.

(c) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife shall be treated as division costs and allocated to the other division purposes. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreational development of water resource projects or disposition of public lands for recreational purposes.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 2. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the San Felipe division shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

Sec. 3. The Secretary may contract with the State of California for the delivery through facilities of the State water project to the San Luis forebay reservoir of all or any part of the water of the Central Valley project assigned to the San Felipe division.

On page 5, line 12, after "Sec. 5.", to strike out "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act." and insert "In view of the special circumstances of the San Felipe

division, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable in the south and north Santa Clara subareas so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir."

After line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

And, on page 6 after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the San Felipe division \$92,880,000 (October 1966 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said division.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of providing irrigation and municipal and industrial water supplies, conserving and developing fish and wildlife resources, enhancing outdoor recreation opportunities and other related purposes, the Secretary of the Interior acting pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, as an addition to, and an integral part of, the Central Valley project, California, the San Felipe division. The principal works of the division shall consist of the Pacheco tunnel, pumping plants, power transmission facilities, canals, pipelines, regulating reservoirs, and distribution facilities. No facilities shall be constructed for electric transmission and distribution service which the Secretary determines, on the basis of an offer of a firm fifty-year contract from a local public or private agency, can through such a contract be obtained at less cost to the Federal Government than by construction and operation of Government facilities.

Sec. 1. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the San Felipe division shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

Sec. 3. The Secretary may contract with the State of California for the delivery through facilities of the State water project to the San Luis forebay reservoir of all or any part of the water of the Central Valley project assigned to the San Felipe division.

Sec. 4. In locating and designing the works and facilities authorized for construction by this Act, and in acquiring or withdrawing any lands as authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall give due consideration to reports prepared by the State of California on

the California water plan, and shall consult with local interests who may be affected by the construction and operation of said works and facilities or by the acquisition or withdrawal of lands, through public hearings or in such manner as in his discretion may be found best suited to a maximum expression of the views of such local interests.

Sec. 5. In view of the special circumstances of the San Felipe division, neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the Act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649) nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable in the south and north Santa Clara subareas so long as the water utilized on project lands is acquired by pumping from the underground reservoir.

Sec. 6. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the San Felipe division \$92,880,000 (October 1966 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said division.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division of the Central Valley project, under which water would be transported from the San Joaquin Valley across Pacheco Pass into the area occupied by San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties, and particularly the city of San Jose.

The Bureau of Reclamation has developed a plan which could alleviate water supply problems of the four counties for many years to come through the importation of water developed by the Central Valley project.

I particularly wish to commend my longtime friend, Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, who has pioneered this important venture. At this time his steadfast efforts are guiding this legislation through the House of Representatives.

This project will eventually provide 273,000 acre-feet of water annually for land in California counties on the west slope of the coast range. Wells in that area are becoming dry, or polluted from boron infiltration, and in the coastal areas, sea water intrusion threatens to become a major problem. Rapid urbanization of the area has also resulted in serious pressures on the existing water supply.

The project water supply will be obtained from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta through the operation of existing facilities of the Central Valley project, and will then be transported through State or Federal facilities from

S 9256

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 10, 1967

The second part of the book that bothered me is the authors' attack on the domino theory. I am not a great domino man myself, but I think there is some truth in it: any decision we make in Vietnam will be watched closely, and will affect other countries in the area. Perhaps the dominoes will be like Thailand, without a colonial past, and will turn out to be of sturdy stuff and will be able to stand, but there will be an effect nevertheless.

The authors dismiss the theory completely, attack Gen. Maxwell Taylor for suggesting it, of what he called "the bandwagon" reaction, and ridicule the Administration for presenting it. If, they say, the United States Government talked about the domino theory in Europe, an area which Americans know, the people here would laugh at it. But that's not quite fair; Europe is different, the European states are basically stronger. I am sure in Eastern Europe where those governments are weak, the Russians think in terms of the domino theory; if one country begins to pull too far. . . .

I checked out their note on this in the back, and there was poor General Taylor making the same point: "There is always a danger of a sort of bandwagon movement, I am afraid, among these very weak countries." Since the domino, or semi-domino theory is one that concerns a good many people in the country, and since it is one of the most basic reasons for the American commitment there, it seems to me that serious historians should at least put the Government's case fairly. The American record in Vietnam is hardly an attractive one in the best light, and hardly needs to be exaggerated.

The third of these books is called "The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam" by three faculty members of the University of California at Berkeley, Franz Schurmann, Peter Dale Scott and Reginald Zelnik (foreword by Schlesinger). It is not so much a book as a White Paper, or Black Paper if you happen to work for the State Department. It is a very tough critique indeed of American actions there, perhaps too tough. Early in the book it charges the Americans with telling General Minh that "progress in the war," not progress in popularity, should be his Government's prime objective.

I was there in those days, and it was more complicated; the Americans, particularly Ambassador Lodge and a group of his younger aides, realized then the mistakes of the past and wanted desperately for Minh to win some popularity. But it was all too late; the Vietcong practically owned the countryside; the vaunted strategic hamlet program existed only in the imagination of the previous Ambassador and American general, and the combination of the political problems and the awesome military difficulties was simply too much for Minh and his generals. No American conspiracy here: simply too little too late.

The theme of this book, relentlessly pursued, is that every time there has been a chance for negotiations in Vietnam the U.S. has chosen to escalate; the other half of that same coin is simply (for all the inane optimistic comments by all the generals and news managers aside, the war has never gone well) that we have escalated only out of desperation, when the previous commitment failed, and we found thereupon that the previous commitment had also pulled us in so much deeper that it was just that much harder to negotiate than ever. Westerners, it turns out, are very sensitive and bad about losing face. Therefore we escalated only out of weakness, when we had nothing to negotiate.

This book has few pretensions, and makes no claim to being objective, being in the *J'accuse* tradition. So if you have someone in your family who is cocksure about our right and might and conduct in Indochina, I suggest this as a present. But if you are already uneasy about the war and its con-

duct, I suspect this will not teach you anything new.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has made a most important contribution to the greatest and most vital issue facing our Nation today.

I suspect what has caused so much concern is that those foreign policy positions in relation to Europe, formed in the years immediately following World War II, have now been applied to Southeast Asia. We heard earlier that we had a moral or legal obligation to go into Vietnam, and that it was in our national security to go in at the inception.

Whether or not this was true at first, as the Senator from New Jersey has pointed out, it is true now, and his analysis of why we cannot withdraw is most meaningful and helpful to me.

Mr. President, I wish to make one observation because I think the Senator developed the point in its entirety. If my memory is correct, it was the Truman doctrine in going into Greece which first announced the proposition that we would go wherever we were requested to help a free, independent nation to maintain its independence against aggression, whether it be by conventional warfare, nuclear blackmail, or guerrilla warfare; and that we would go in if we were requested to do so.

I understand the point of the Senator to be, and it is so well taken, that: "Yes, we will go but only under conditions that those free people are willing to do their fair share, uphold their responsibility, accept their own burdens of freedom, and their burdens of participating in their defense and independence."

I think that the Senator has made a great contribution and it has had a great influence on me. I thank the Senator for the comments he has made today.

Mr. CASE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

If I were to capsule what I think our policy should be, it should be always calculated, conceived, and carried out with one clear guiding principle: The best interests of the United States. We can hardly do more than that. It seems that when we attempt to proceed in broad generalizations we only get in bad trouble and do more harm.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself this morning to the crisis in the Middle East and the policy of the United States with regard to it. In my judgment the present policy of the United States is a sound one. We should persist in it.

As I see evidence of efforts to shake,

divert, or perhaps even blackmail us away from it, I think it is very important that a statement with respect to our constancy of policy should be reiterated. We should not allow ourselves to be misled by the Soviet Union which at least verbally is pursuing a line unlikely to attain a stable and durable peace which the United States has, very properly, announced as its objective in the resolution filed for consideration by the United Nations General Assembly on June 20, 1967.

The refusal of the General Assembly to support the Arab line—backed in debate by the Soviet Union—in effect to continue the state of war of the last 20 years in the Middle East has preserved the peace credibility of the United Nations. In my judgment, the action of the General Assembly has served to preserve the cease-fire and has been a credible action in that respect.

I learned a long time ago that "no" is also an answer and that is what the General Assembly gave to Arab efforts to continue the belligerent situation, and to the Soviet Union with respect to its policy. I hope Soviet policy will be revised, and I understand the leaders in the Kremlin are considering this now. It is discreditable to them and dangerous to the cause of peace to continue on the path of vituperation and opportunism.

The Soviet Union has engaged itself most unwisely in seeking to redeem in the United Nations what the Arab leaders lost in war. It looks as if this effort is going to be transferred to the Security Council. That is where the constancy of American policy should now be demonstrated. Any effort to go back to the old policy which bedeviled the Middle East for 20 years should not be permitted by the United States to succeed in the Security Council after failing in the General Assembly. We must remember that so long as the present situation continues there is danger. Accordingly, we will remain in the present dangerous situation of cease-fire—with peace or war still in the balance—for some time, perhaps months. We see the incident on the banks of the Suez Canal emphasizing the danger which continues to persist.

My purpose in speaking today is to affirm my belief that the policy of the United States as announced and developed should be constant. In this connection I would like to praise the team headed by McGeorge Bundy, Walt Rostow in the White House, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Ambassador Arthur Goldberg at the United Nations, which has shown great devotion and skill during the most harrowing moments of the Middle East crisis.

Considering the Soviet Union's reckless, irresponsible supply of massive arms to President Nasser and Syria and its military demonstration of support—like the current one of sending Soviet warships into a fighting zone near the Suez Canal—the utmost resolution will be required on the part of the United States if the situation is not to deteriorate again into open conflict. The Arab leaders might be misled into trying a "second round" by Soviet arms supply, or, in the sheer effort to redeem their shredded prestige to launch military incidents like those now resulting in the fighting in the